## PATENT COOPERATION TREATRYC'D 12 DEC 2005

### **PCT**

WIPO PCT

### INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

1_4	Applicant's or agent's file reference 00174			FOR FURTHER ACTION  See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)						
ınteri	national a	pplica	tion No.	International filing date (da	y/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)				
International application No. PCT/EP 03/14796				23.12.2003		23.12.2003				
Inten	national P	atent	Classification (IPC) or b	oth national classification and	IPC					
	F3/023									
Appl	licant									
		RPC	RATION							
1.	This in	terna	tional preliminary exa	mination report has been	prepared by this	International Preliminary Examining				
	Author	ity a	nd is transmitted to the	e applicant according to A	TICIE 30.					
2.	This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet.									
	r-1 -	<b>-</b> L.1	enant is also assered	anied by ANNEXES. i.e. s	heets of the des	cription, claims and/or drawings which have				
	been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets domaining the PCT).  (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).									
	These annexes consist of a total of sheets.									
3.	3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:									
	11.101	epor		relating to the following ite	ems:					
-		epor 🛛	t contains indications  Basis of the opinion	relating to the following ite	ems: ··					
	1		Basis of the opinion			sten and industrial applicability				
	l H	Ø	Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of	of opinion with regard to no		step and industrial applicability				
	t H H		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of the control of	of opinion with regard to no	ovelty, inventive					
	l II III IV		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve	of opinion with regard to no	ovelty, inventive	step and industrial applicability elty, inventive step or industrial applicability;				
	l II III IV		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve Reasoned statemer citations and explan Certain documents	of opinion with regard to no ntion It under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) wi ations supporting such sta cited	ovelty, inventive th regard to nove tement					
	         V 		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve Reasoned statemer citations and explan Certain documents Certain defects in the	of opinion with regard to no ntion It under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) wi ations supporting such sta cited Ie international application	ovelty, inventive th regard to nove tement					
	I II IV V		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve Reasoned statemer citations and explan Certain documents Certain defects in the	of opinion with regard to no ntion It under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) wi ations supporting such sta cited	ovelty, inventive th regard to nove tement					
	I II IV V VI VII		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve Reasoned statemer citations and explan Certain documents Certain defects in the	of opinion with regard to no ntion It under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) wi ations supporting such sta cited Ie international application	ovelty, inventive th regard to nove tement					
	I II IV V VI VII		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve Reasoned statemer citations and explan Certain documents Certain defects in the	of opinion with regard to no ntion It under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) wi ations supporting such sta cited Ie international application	ovelty, inventive th regard to nove itement ication	elty, inventive step or industrial applicability;				
	         V         		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve Reasoned statemer citations and explan Certain documents Certain defects in the	of opinion with regard to no ntion It under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) wi ations supporting such sta cited Ie international application	ovelty, inventive th regard to nove tement	elty, inventive step or industrial applicability;				
	         V         		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve Reasoned statemer citations and explan Certain documents Certain defects in the Certain observation	of opinion with regard to no ntion It under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) wi ations supporting such sta cited Ie international application	th regard to nove	elty, inventive step or industrial applicability;				
Da	         V         		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve Reasoned statemer citations and explan Certain documents Certain defects in the Certain observation	of opinion with regard to no ntion It under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) wi ations supporting such sta cited Ie international application	ovelty, inventive th regard to nove itement ication	elty, inventive step or industrial applicability;				
Da 14	   	Marian Manian Marian Marian Marian Marian Marian Marian Marian Marian Ma	Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve Reasoned statemer citations and explan Certain documents Certain defects in the Certain observation on of the demand	of opinion with regard to no ntion It under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) wi ations supporting such sta cited he international application s on the international appl	th regard to nove	elty, inventive step or industrial applicability;				
Da 18	I II III IV V VI VII VIII ate of sub	M C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve Reasoned statemer citations and explan Certain documents Certain defects in the Certain observation on of the demand	of opinion with regard to no ntion it under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) wi ations supporting such sta cited he international application s on the international appl	th regard to nover the reg	elty, inventive step or industrial applicability;				
Da 18	I II III IV V VI VII VIII ate of sub	Mailin exam	Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve Reasoned statemer citations and explan Certain documents Certain defects in the Certain observation on of the demand  g address of the internationing authority: Irropean HV Rijswilk - Pagen HV	of opinion with regard to no ntion at under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) wi ations supporting such sta cited he international application is on the international appl tional	th regard to nover the reg	elty, inventive step or industrial applicability;				
Da 14	I II III IV V VI VII VIII ate of sub	Mailin mission example of the control of the contro	Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve Reasoned statemer citations and explan Certain documents Certain defects in the Certain observation on of the demand	of opinion with regard to no ntion at under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) wi ations supporting such sta cited he international application is on the international appl tional	Date of completion 12.12.2005  Authorized Office Schröter, P	elty, inventive step or industrial applicability;				

### INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/EP 03/14796

I.	<b>Basis</b>	of the	report
----	--------------	--------	--------

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application (Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17)):

	Des	cription, Pages						
	1-42	2	as originally filed					
	Clai	ms, Numbers						
		•	and the file of					
	1-30	)	as originally filed					
	Drav	wings, Sheets						
	1/16	-16/16	as originally filed					
2.	With lang	n regard to the <b>langua</b> Juage in which the inte	age, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the ernational application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.					
	The	se elements were ava	ailable or furnished to this Authority in the following language: , which is:					
		the language of a tra	nslation furnished for the purposes of the international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).					
		the language of publi	cation of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).					
		the language of a tra Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3	nslation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under 3).					
3.	With inte	n regard to any <b>nucle</b> rnational preliminary e	otide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:					
		contained in the inter	rnational application in written form.					
		filed together with the	e international application in computer readable form.					
		furnished subsequer	ntly to this Authority in written form.					
		furnished subsequer	ntly to this Authority in computer readable form.					
		The statement that to in the international a	he subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure pplication as filed has been furnished.					
		The statement that the listing has been furn	he information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence ished.					
4.	The	amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:						
		the description,	pages:					
		the claims,	Nos.:					
		the drawings,	sheets:					

# INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/EP 03/14796

5. 
This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed (Rule 70.2(c)).

(Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.)

6. Additional observations, if necessary:

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

3-7,9-15,21,27,28,30

No: Claims

1,2,8,16-20,22-26,29

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1-30

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims No: Claims 1-30

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

#### Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

Reference is made to the following documents:

- D1: US-A-5 473 346 (POLLACK JORDAN) 5 December 1995 (1995-12-05)
- D2: US 2002/175834 A1 (MILLER MARITN) 28 November 2002 (2002-11-28)
- D3: DE 101 47 938 A (SIEMENS AG) 17 April 2003 (2003-04-17)
- D4: SILFVERBERG M ET AL ASSOCIATION FOR COMPUTING MACHINERY: "PREDICTING TEXT ENTRY SPEED ON MOBILE PHONES" 1 April 2000 (2000-04-01), CHI 2000 CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS. CONFERENCE ON HUMAN FACTORS IN COMPUTING SYSTEMS. THE HAGUE, NETHERLANDS, APRIL 1 - 5, 2000, CHI CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS. HUMAN FACTORS IN COMPUTING SYSTEMS, NEW YORK, NY: ACM, US, PAGE(S) 9-16, XP001090162 ISBN: 0-201-48563-X
- INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1, 16, 22 AND 29 1.
- 1.1 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT. The document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):
  - A method for entering data in an electronic terminal (column 9, lines 6-30, figures 17-19) having a four-way ('forward, back,... left and right') input device ('keyswitch' or 'joystick') with a center position ('home state') and a sensor associated with each of the four ways, the method comprising the steps of:
  - allocating a data value ('unique binary value') to each of the four possible input device movement sequences that comprise a movement of the input device from the center position in one of the four ways followed by a return of the input device to the center position ('Back-Release, Forward-Release, Right-Release, Left-Release'; fig. 19);

allocating a data value ('unique binary value') to each of the eight possible input device movement sequences that comprise a movement of the input device from the center position in one of the four ways followed by a movement of the input device in another of the four ways without passing through the center position (sequences no.

#### **EXAMINATION REPORT - SEPARATE SHEET**

2, 7, 10, 15, 31, 36, 39, 44 in fig. 19); detecting the input device movement sequences ('paths') with the sensors associated with the four ways; and

entering the data allocated to an input device movement sequence ('unique characters or symbols') upon detection by the sensors of the input device movement sequence concerned.

D1 therefore discloses all the features of independent claim 1.

- 1.2 The same reasoning applies, mutatis mutandis, to the subject-matter of the corresponding independent claims 16, 22 and 29, which therefore are also considered not new.
- 2. INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 27, 28 AND 30
- 2.1 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 27, 28 and 30 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

#### 2.2 CLAIM 27

Claim 27 differs from claim 1 only in that groups of letters are assigned as data values, which are then sent to a predictive editor application. It is well-known in the art to aid the user in efficiently inputting information into an electronic mobile terminal by using a predictive editor application using letters or groups of letters, such as T9. See for example D4, page 10.

The subject-matter of claim 27 therefore lacks an inventive step.

#### 2.3 CLAIM 28

Claim 28 differs from claim 1 only in that the function of the center sensor is shown on the display of the electronic mobile terminal. The use of softkeys on a display to aid the user in verifying the current function of a physical key is well-known in the art. The subject-matter of claim 28 therefore lacks an inventive step.

#### 2.4 CLAIM 30

The use of five keys, one being an enter key, rather than four is a matter of normal design procedure in order to allow for explicit entry of data by a user.

The subject-matter of claim 30 therefore lacks an inventive step.

3. Dependent claims 2-15, 17-21 and 23-26 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step, see documents D1-D4 and the corresponding passages cited in the search report.